

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPĻICATION NO.	FILING DATE	· FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,602	07/30/2003	Kristian Hammond	08803-023	6135
	7590 06/01/2007 , WILL & EMERY	EXAMINER		
600 13th Street, N.W.			TRUONG, CAMQUY	
Washington, DC 20005-3096			ART UNIT .	PAPER NUMBER
			2195	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/629,602	HAMMOND ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Camquy Truong	2195			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	1				
Period fo	r Reply		·			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Donesions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror , cause the application to become ABANDON	NN. imely filed m the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 Ju	<u>uly 2003</u> .	•			
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
Applicati	on Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
2) Notic 3) Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail C 5) Notice of Informal	Date			
Pape	r No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/11/05</u> .	6)				

Application/Control Number: 10/629,602 Page 2

Art Unit: 2195

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-32 are presented for examination.

2. It is noted that although the present application does contain line numbers in the specification and claims, the line numbers in the claims do not correspond to the preferred format. The preferred format is to number each line of every claim, with each claim beginning with line 1. For ease of reference by both the examiner and Applicant all future correspondence should include the recommended line numbering.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

- 3. Claims 1- 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are directed to non-statutory subject matter.
- 4. Claims 1, 13, 24, 28 raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea, and would not result in a practical application producing a useful, concrete, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35.U.S.C. 101. For example, determining properties, generating a context, retrieving transformation rule, and transforming the context are an abstract idea that does not produce any tangible result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 10, 13, 15-16, 18-19, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Celis et al. (U.S. Patent 6,021,405).
- 6. As to claims 1, and 13, Celis teaches the invention as claimed include:a method for formulating context representations for use in information services based on an active task being manipulated by a user, comprising the steps of:

determining properties related to the active task (determine the number and combinations of required physical properties that will be considered for each input's plan as well as the sequence that each input query is to be considered, col. 12, lines 42-51; col. 14, lines 29-31, and lines 48-52; col. 24, lines 14-17);

generating a context representation based on an analysis of the active task (generating a context for an expression input query with selected required physical properties, col. 14, lines 27-31, lines 46-57; col. 24, lines 13-61);

retrieving at least one transformation rule corresponding to the properties related to the active task (the rules are selected and stored in a preferred order of ex4cution which is based on the promise value associated with the rule, col. 20, lines 65-67; col. 21, lines 14-16); and

Page 4

Art Unit: 2195

transforming the context representation by applying the at least one transformation rule corresponding to the properties related to the active task (col. 21, lines 14-20; col. 22, lines 18-54; col. 19, line 63 – col. 20, line 25).

- 7. As to claim 3, 15, Celis teaches the properties include attributes related to attributes of application software used in performing the active task (col. 20, lines 65-66; col. 22, lines 40-44).
- 8. As to claims 4, and 16, Celis teaches the attributes of application software used to perform the active task include at least one of the identity of the application software and the type of the application software (col. 17, lines 20-30).
- 9. As to claims 6, and 18, Celis teaches the at least one transformation rule corresponding to the properties related to the active task includes eliminating text included in a signature section (col. 19, line 63 col. 20, line 30).
- 10. As to claim 7, Celis teaches the properties are related to the subject matter of the active task or the genre or type of the active task (col. 2, lines 53-59; col. 9, lines 36-42).
- 11. As to claims 8, and 19, Celis teaches the properties related to the active task is determined based on an indication provided by the user (col. 2, lines 40-59).

12. As to claims 10, and 21, Celis teaches transforming the context representation based on a user input related to a trait of search (col. 4, line 66 – col. 5, line 12).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 13. Claims 2, 5, 9, 11-12, 14, 17, 20, and 22-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Celis et al. (U.S. Patent 6,021,405) in view of August et al. (U.S. Patent 6,647,383 B1).
- 14. As to claims 24 and 28, Celis teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a method for formulating context representations of an active task comprising the steps of:

generating at least one constituent of the context representation (generating a context for an expression input query with selected required physical properties, col. 14, lines 27-31, lines 46-57; col. 24, lines 13-61).

Celis does not explicitly teach accessing information related to attributes of a user; and modifying the at least one constituent of the context representation based on the attributes of the user. However, August teaches accessing information related to attributes of a user (col. 19, lines 32-41; col. 22, lines 12-20); and modifying the at least

one constituent of the context representation based on the attributes of the user (col. 23, lines 7-19 and lines 54 –65; col. 24, lines 9-19).

- 15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that to incorporate the teaching of accessing information related to attributes of a user; and modifying the at least one constituent of the context representation based on the attributes of the user as taught by August to the invention of Celis because this would improve in information search engines to eliminate or reduce the difficulties, and to satisfy the needs, are desired.
- 16. As to claims 2, and 14, August teaches the properties include attributes related to the user (col. 12, lines 44-63; col. 16, lines 39-41; col. 18, lines 32-39).
- 17. As to claims 5, and 17, August teaches the application software is an e-mail application (col. 26, lines 54-56).
- 18. At to claim 18, Celis teaches the at least one-transformation rule corresponding to the properties related to the active task includes eliminating text included in a signature section (col. 19, line 63 col. 20, line 30).
- 19. As to claims 9, and 20, August teaches the user indicates the subject matter of the active task by clicking a button included in a graphic user interface (col. 22, lines 32-

Application/Control Number: 10/629,602 Page 7

Art Unit: 2195

39; col. 25, lines 37-67).

20. As to claims 11 and 22, August teaches control the data processing system to determine an information source on which an information search should be conducted based on the properties of the active task (col. 23, lines 7-23 and lines 54-65).

21. As to claims 12 and 23, August teaches:

retrieving information related to properties of the information source (col. 19, lines 32-41; col. 22, lines 12-20); and

further transforming the context representation based on the properties of the information source (col. 23, lines 7-19 and lines 54 –65; col. 24, lines 9-19).

- 22. As to claims 25, and 29, August teaches conducting an information search based on a result of the modifying step (col. 23, lines 7-19 and lines 54 –65; col. 24, lines 9-19).
- 23. As to claims 26, and 30, August teaches information search is conducted in information sources selected based on the attributes of the user (col. 5, lines 12-25).
- 24. As to claims 27, and 31, August teaches the attributes of the user include ate least one of the user's occupation, the user's position or role in an organization, and the user's major (col. 9, lines 24-49; col. 24, line 59 col. 25, line 12).

25. As to claim 32, August teaches:

the determining step is performed by executing a first software program by a data processing system (col. 11, lines 3-45);

the generating step, the retrieving step and the transforming are performed by executing a second software program by the data processing system (col. 23, lines 7-19 and lines 54 –65; col. 24, lines 9-19); and

the first software program and the second software program reside on different machines (Fig. 1).

Conclusion

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Camquy Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-3773. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM – 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3756.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR of Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

Application/Control Number: 10/629,602

Art Unit: 2195

Page 9

have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

Camquy Truong

May 14, 2007

MÉNG-AL T. AN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINED TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100